DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 828 CS 508 849

AUTHOR Danielson, Mary Ann; Hollwitz, John
TITLE Evaluating Directors of Forensics: From Dimensions to Prototype.
PUB DATE Nov 94
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (80th, New Orleans, LA, November 19-22, 1994). For a related paper, see ED 366 022.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Debate; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Persuasive Discourse; Reliability; Undergraduate Students; Validity
IDENTIFIERS Debate Tournaments; *Forensic Directors

ABSTRACT

A study expands on an earlier study by developing a prototypical evaluation instrument for directors of forensics. A 3-part questionnaire was constructed to assess the reliability and validity of the instrument used in the earlier study. Questionnaires were returned by 63 of 205 directors of forensics programs representing both public and private institutions of varying sizes and all types of forensics programs. Results indicated that the prototype for forensics evaluation: (1) must include the four dimensions of arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments, administering the speech/debate program, coaching speech/debate participants, and accounting and bookkeeping; (2) should include the four dimensions of recruiting students for the speech/debate program, teaching a speech/debate class(es), directing on-campus tournaments, and counseling and advising speech/debate students; and (3) may include the two dimensions of college/university and community service involvement and moderating speech/debate student groups. Findings suggest areas in which academic departments might focus selection and recruitment efforts and provide a way to diagnose needs for faculty training. (Contains 17 references and one table of data. A standard evaluation form and an expanded evaluation form are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 380 828

Evaluating Directors of Forensics: From Dimensions to Prototype

by
Mary Ann Danielson
Instructor
Creighton University

and
Dr. John Hollwitz
Associate Professor,
Creighton University

Presented
at the annual convention of the
Speech Communication Association
New Orleans, LA
1994

CS508849

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Danielson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Evaluating Directors of Forensics: From Dimensions to Prototype

Forensics evaluation surfaced as an issue in 1974, 1984, and in the early 1990s. Despite repeated attention, little has resulted from forensic educators' discussions. Rieke, in 1968, warned that "criticisms [in forensics] are frequently regarded as a life or death matter, and to admit any inadequacy or disadvantage might result in the elimination of forensics altogether" (p. 59). This fear of criticism addressed by Rieke (1968) may explain the overall lack of evaluation and evaluative tools in forensics today.

The lack of forensics evaluation seems especially prevalent at the administrative level. While forensics educators may concede that the evaluation of students' performances, judges' ballots, or trends in forensics activities is necessary, very few forensics educators/ researchers have turned the evaluative spotlight on themselves--the Directors of Forensics (DOFs). Given increasing societal and educational pressure for accountability (Alexander, 1993; Schnoor, 1993), DOFs are forced to address, at least minimally, the issue of evaluating the forensics educator's performance.

In previous research, Hollwitz and Danielson (1992) developed and tested an evaluative instrument to be utilized by and for DOFs. This paper expands upon the previous research in that it developes a prototypical evaluation instrument for DOFs. Specifically, this paper will provide a historical background on forensics evaluation, briefly introduce how the job assessment approach has been utilized to evaluate forensics, delineate both the dimensions and tasks in the prototypical evaluation instrument(s), and conclude with a discussion of the study's implications for the forensics community.

Evaluating Directors of Forensics

Historically, the evaluation of the DOF's performance was addressed via the traditional university standards for promotion and/or tenure. Confereus, at the 1974 Sedalia Conference, recommended that "the forensics educator should meet the department and institutional criteria for promotion, tenure and compensation. . . . They [forensics educators] should not be held to higher standards, nor do they seek lower standards" (Definitional statement, 1974, p. 47). Whereas no one in forensics is arguing for lower evaluation standards, disagreement does exist on the criterion or criteria utilized for evaluation.

While the Sedalia Conference's conclusion, that "the primary criterion for evaluating the performance of the forensics educator should be teaching effectiveness, including the directing of forensics as a teaching function" (Definitional statement, 1974, p. 47), has been generally supported (Boileau, 1990), not all forensics educators agree. Some DOFs recognize that forensics activities cut across all three areas of traditional (although not universal) academic evaluation: teaching, scholarship and service, and they argue that evaluations should reflect their contributions in each of these three areas (AFA Policy, 1993). Dudczak (1985) summarizes best the paradox inherent in this paradigm when he states:

> They [DOFs] have a unique assignment which cuts across all three areas of the traditional categories for promotion and tenure, yet their evaluation either categorizes their efforts within a single category [usually service which is weighted the least in tenure and promotion decisions], or understates it by making quantitative comparisons of output without cognizance of assignment load [assigned loads given to forensics, if one is given at all, is typically in the range of 1/4 to 1/3 of an appointment, while the actual load of the forensics assignment required by the activity is upwards of 2/3 to 3/4

assignment]. In either case the forensics educator often finds his/her relative evaluation diminished in comparison with department peers. (pp. 10-11)

Ten years later, position papers presented at the Second National Conference on Forensics (1984) reflect the attitude that it is in the forensics educators' best interest to develop some form of evaluation which would recognize the various contributions made by the DOFs. Congalton states,

> . . . . forensics coaches must work to ensure that they are receiving credit for the many tasks which they perform. When the forensics specialist is called upon to serve numerous roles, ranging from coach to administrator, then some value should be placed on all the tasks which a forensics coach carries out. Evaluation committees should be made aware of the totality of a forensics coach's responsibilities. Only then, will forensics educators be given credit for the many tasks which they are called upon to perform. (Dudczak & Zarefsky, 1984, p. 33)

Despite the perceived need for a promotion and tenure instrument, the end result of the (1984) Conference was only a listing of possible criteria for evaluation.

"The [1984] document provides a sound basis for the evaluation of DOFs if the departments, colleges, and universities are willing to adapt their procedures and evaluations to individual cases. Again, there is no data to suggest that such is the case, and . . . [DOFs] are no better off than before" (Richardson, 1991, p. 4). What we have seen since 1984 is increasing role tensions, decreasing life [career] expectancy of a DOF [58% of all DOFs are in their first five years of coaching, only 20% of DOFs coach more than 10 years], and shortchanging of educational goals (Dudczak, 1985; Richardson, 1991).

Twenty years after the Sedalia Conference, forensics educators' progress toward development and utilization of evaluative instruments is minimal. Sternhagen (1994), in his

recent review of forensics program evaluation, concludes that "there seems to be a lack of work examining how forensics programs are evaluated" (p. 2). Despite strong "accountability" and pragmatic rationales, forensic educators have hesitated to proactively address issues of evaluation (The work completed by the AFA Policy Debate Caucus is the one exception).

It is now 1994, and the need for forensics evaluation has not diminished. If anything, it has increased, and the forensics community can no longer ignore educational administrators' demands for evaluation. Schmalz (1989) observes that "the complicated process of assessing faculty productivity is perhaps the most exasperating task facing higher education today" (p. B2). The public sector agrees. The pursuit of effective performance appraisal occupies most organizations in the public section. Equal employment legislation and court decisions will make this pursuit even more important in coming years (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984). The educational accountability movement will impose further pressure upon higher education, and the forensics community will not likely be exempt. Albert (1991) argues that forensics practitioners and administrators should provide (university) administrators with some consensus about the guidelines for evaluation. "From an administrative standpoint, the challenge of considering forensics is the challenge of evaluating forensics activities in which faculty members participate. Administrators would benefit if forensics practitioners and administrators could develop some consensus about the guidelines which should be used to evaluate the forensics work of faculty members" (Albert, 1991, p. 7). Because evaluation at the college and university level will continue, there exists a need for an evaluative instrument that reflects the true dimensions of DOFs.

Job Analysis

Borrowing from industrial/organizational assessment, an evaluation instrument was constructed (Hollwitz & Danielson, 1992) to identify and measure the various dimensions,

tasks, and worker characteristics associated with performing the functions of the DOF. The instrument was based on the three attributes used in job analysis and assessment: Knowledge, Skills and Abilities (usually referred to as KSAs). These three attributes are defined by the Uniform Guidelines (1978) as: Knowledge is the body of information pertinent to a job; Skills are the psychomotor capabilities (ability to perform basic skills or functions of the job); and Abilities are a behavioral competence. Although the potential for overlapping areas does exist and has been noted, KSAs are important as they provide a way to customize selection and classification procedures.

Job analysis has multiple purposes which include personnel administration, the reduction of exposure to legal liability, and (as in our case) an increase in understanding of and evaluation for a specific academic position. The specific job analysis process uses three steps or stages. (For a more complete description of the creation process, see Hollwitz & Danielson, 1992.) In stage one, job experts who had served as debate and forensics directors identified important tasks and dimensions. Ten overall dimensions emerged through interviews, archival materials and the Managerial and Professional Job Functions Inventory (MPJFI), a standardized job analysis measure (Baehr, Lonergan, & Hunt, 1988). In stage two, job experts rated tasks associated with these dimensions for their criticality (based on those which are most important for the job, occupy the greatest amount of time on the job, or both). Ninety-two tasks (68%) reached the cutoff criterion for importance or frequency. In stage three, job experts used the final list of tasks and dimensions to derive a list of requisite worker characteristics. These characteristics are the KSAs, and they provide a way to customize selection and describe satisfactory performance in a position.

In completing the three stages, the following ten dimensions were identified: accounting and bookkeeping; administering the speech/debate program; arranging students' participation in

off-campus tournaments; coaching speech/debate participants; college/university and community service involvement; counseling and advising speech/debate students; directing on-campus tournaments; moderating speech/debate student group(s); recruiting students for the speech/debate program; and teaching a speech/debate class(es). Each dimension has various tasks associated with it. For example, the tasks associated with accounting and bookkeeping included knowledge of basic accounting principles, knowledge of university bookkeeping procedures, and skill at double-entry bookkeeping.

In a subsequent evaluation of the reliability and validity of the instrument, eight of the original ten dimensions achieved means (x) of 2.0 or higher (on a 3.0 scale). The four[1] "essential" dimensions (x of 2.5 or higher) of the DOF's position included (in rank order by mean): arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments; administering the speech/debate program; coaching speech/debate participants; and accounting and bookkeeping. Four[1] "relevant" dimensions (x of 2.0-2.49) of the DOF's position included (in rank order by mean): recruiting students for the speech/debate program; teaching a speech/debate class; directing on-campus tournaments; and counseling and advising speech/debate students. The two original dimensions that are "possibly relevant" to all programs (x of less than 2.0) included: college/university and community service involvement (1.98) and moderating speech/debate student group(s) (1.44).

Results showed little difference in response attributable to program type, institutional type or institutional size. One dimension, "arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments," showed differences across institutions of different sizes ($F[4, 56] = 3.35$, $p < .05$). Post-hoc analyses showed that institutions which enrolled fewer than 20,000 students rated this dimension as more essential than did institutions with greater than 20,000 ($p<.05$).

No additional differences emerged among subgroups of institutions with fewer than 20,000 students.

The reliability of the measures was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. A reliability score of .95 was achieved. Further, respondents provided strong initial evidence of the content validity of dimensions and tasks. In their responses to individual dimensions, respondents collectively listed 457 tasks of 630 that could possibly have been listed from 63 completed forms, each with ten dimensions, a 72.5% completion rate.

These tasks strongly suggested that the original job analysis had acceptable content validity. Of those 457 tasks which respondents volunteered, 99% were associated with the same dimension that had emerged in the original form. This rate of agreement vastly exceeds the 60% to 70% acceptability standard usually accepted as part of the "retranslation method" (Smith & Kendall, 1963), by which job analysts commonly approximate a cross-validation of dimension and task associations.

In an extension of this earlier work, we reanalyze the data to better delineate the "essential" tasks associated with each of the eight essential or relevant dimensions. The end result: protoypical evaluation instrument(s) capable of adaptation by institution type and size, program type and size, budget, and/or personnel.

METHOD

Survey Instrument Design

A three part questionnaire was constructed to assess the reliability and validity of the (1992) instrument. Part one identified the ten dimensions and asked the respondents to rank, on a three-point Likert scale, how critical each dimension was in conducting their job (1= not essential, 2= moderately essential, and 3= essential), and list a task(s) associated with that dimension. Respondents were provided the opportunity to "write in" additional dimensions

(those not previously cited within the original ten) that they believed to be essential to their job. To avoid the possibility of respondents falling into a "response set" (rating the tasks at the same level as the controlling dimension), tasks associated with the various dimensions were separated into their respective Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities categories and listed in Part two.

Part two of the questionnaire addressed the different forms of Knowledge, Skills, Abilities, and Worker Characteristics. Respondents were asked to rate each of the items (tasks) three times: once, for the importance of the item for job success (1= minor importance for success, 2= average importance for success, and 3= high importance for success); once, for the difficulty associated with learning the task on the job (1 = easily learned, 2= average difficulty in learning, and 3= difficult to learn); and once, for the importance of having this feature of the job on the first day of work (1= little importance, 2= average importance, and 3= high importance).

Part three of the questionnaire asked the respondents to provide demographic information about the type of institution (private; public, 2-year; and public, 4-year), size of institution, type of program (speech, debate, or some form of joint program), and size of program (measured by number of participants, staffing, and travel budget).

Respondents

In the spring of 1993, surveys were mailed to 210 forensics programs, representing both public and private institutions, of varying sizes, and all types of forensics programs (speech only, debate only, and various forms of joint speech/debate). Forensics programs were selected from the mailing list generated for a joint speech/debate tournament and represented a national scope.

Five surveys were returned undeliverable or indicating that a program no longer existed at that institution. Sixty-three of the remaining 205 surveys were completed and returned for a response rate of 31%. (While a 38% response rate was sought, the lower-than-expected return may be due to the timing of the survey. Surveys were mailed in mid-March with a response requested by early April. The timing of this survey conflicted with year-end travel to district and national tournaments.) Six coders were trained to transfer survey data to computer scantron sheets. A review of six surveys (approximately 10%) found an error rate of only .004 (.4%).

Data Analysis

The tasks were evaluated, using the mean (x) scores of the responses, according to the following scale: tasks with means of 2.5 or greater (on a 3.0 scale) were considered "essential" tasks; tasks with means of 2.0-2.49 (on a 3.0 scale) were considered "relevant" tasks; and tasks with means below 2.0 (on a 3.0 scale) were considered "possible" tasks. Additionally, the data were analyzed for measurement reliability using Cronbach's alpha. Finally, analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to determine if the tasks varied significantly by type of institution, size of institution, or type of program.

RESULTS

Twelve tasks achieved means (x) of 2.5 or higher (on the 3.0 scale). The twelve "essential" tasks (x of 2.5 or higher) of the DOF's position included (in rank order by mean): ability to build good working-group relations; knowledge of campus funding procedures; ability to improve participants' morale, willingness to travel to speech and debate tournaments on Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays; skill at listening to student concerns; knowledge of rules

regulating speech and debate competitions; ability to assess student proficiency in speech and debate class(es); ability to formulate team goals, knowledge of national forensics rules and regulations; skill at safe driving; ability to conduct rehearsals; and ability to identify appropriate selections/topics for use in performances. Eleven "relevant" tasks (x of 2.0-2.49) of the the DOF's position included (in rank order by mean): ability to motivate subordinates; knowledge of university bookkeeping procedures; knowledge of newspapers or periodicals used in speech/debate preparation; ability to match participants with competition events; ability to run speech and debate tournaments; skill at lecturing on speech/debate topics; skill at writing reports; knowledge of basic accounting principles; knowledge of university insurance procedures; knowledge of university recruiting and admissions policies; and ability to drive different university-owned vehicles. The eleven remaining items scored less than 2.0 and will be excluded from our discussion.

A compilation of dimensions and tasks results in the creation of two evaluation instruments: the standard and expanded evaluation forms. The standard evaluation instrument consists of eight essential and relevant dimensions and twelve essential tasks (See Appendix A). An expanded evaluation model is also offered. By combining both essential and relevent dimensions and tasks, the final product includes eight dimensions and twenty three tasks (See Appendix B).

As Table 1 indicates, data were provided by a wide range of respondents which were charactized by type and size of institution, and type and size of program. Approximately three-fourths (77%) of the respondents were affiliated with public institutions. Over 90% of the respondents represented institutions of at least 1,000 students.

- - - - -

Table 1 goes about here

- - - - -

All types of programs were represented in this study. The majority of the programs (57%) were joint speech/debate programs. The types of debate represented included National Debate Tournament (NDT), Cross-Examination Debate Association (CEDA), Parliamentary, and Lincoln-Douglas (L-D). For purposes of tabulation, if a school identified itself as either "both debate (L-D) and speech" or as "speech only," but listed L-D debate, it was classified as speech with L-D debate (a newly created category). [The survey's original categorization scheme did not account for individual events programs that include L-D debate, as does the National Forensics Association's National Tournament.] Speech-only programs comprised 20% of the sample, followed by debate-only programs (15%) and speech with L-D debate programs (8%).

The size of the program was measured using number of participants, staffing, and travel budget. Respondents represented programs of every size, as program size ranged from "less than five" competitors (7%) to "over 40" competitors (12%). Various combinations of staffing existed in these programs. Staffing involved full-time faculty, part-time faculty, graduate teaching assistants, and paid assistants. Full-time only staffs (35%), closely followed by joint full-time staffs with graduate teaching assistants (30%), comprised the predominant form(s) of staffing. The average staff size (165 total staff identified/62 programs) was 2.66 members. Travel budgets varied greatly across program, with the budgets ranging from $2,500 to $70,000. The majority of the programs (55%) had travel budgets of less than $20,000 (many respondents noted that their budgets were "not enough").

The reliability of the measures was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. A reliability score of .99 was achieved.

DISCUSSION

This study described the development and initial validation of a job analysis for forensics program directors. A sample of current forensics directors provided evidence that the prototype for forensics evaluation, according to the results of this study, must include the four dimensions of arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments, administering the speech/debate program, coaching speech/debate participants, and accounting and bookkeeping; should include the four dimensions of recruiting students for the speech/debate program, teaching a speech/debate class(es), directing on-campus tournaments, and counseling and advising speech/debate students; and may include the two dimensions of college/university and community service involvement and moderating speech/debate student groups. Twelve "essential" and eleven "relevant" tasks are arranged to form two possible evaluation instruments: the standard evaluation instrument and the expanded evaluation instrument.

Variations on the standard evaluation forms are also possible and encouraged. While tasks varied in importance by type of institution, size of program, number of participants, and budget, the greatest variability occurred between types of program. In general, debate-only programs rated knowledge of forensics rules and regulations, skill at listening to student concerns, ability to build good working-group relations, ability to conduct rehearsals, and ability to identify appropriate selections/topics for use in performances as less important than did individuals events (IE)programs and joint IE and debate programs. This may indicate the need for either separate evaluation forms for debate-only programs or altering the weightings of items within the standard form to better reflect the demands of administering a debate-only forensics program.

While "identification of appropriate selections/topics for use in performances" may understandably be less relevant to debate-only programs, the devaluation of "knowledge of rules and regulations", "ability to build good working-group relations" and "ability to conduct rehearsals" by debate-only programs is surprising. Perhaps, through our evaluation efforts, forensics evaluation can also be used to discover program outcomes beyond intended results, as Sternhagen (1994) postulates. Future research should explore the function(s) that forensics evaluation can serve in improving educational practices.

Performance evaluation is only one aspect of human resources practice. The analyses described in this paper can support three further applications to debate and forensics administration. First, the analyses suggest areas in which academic departments might particularly focus selection and recruitment (of DOFs) efforts. Search committees can use such scales to compare position applicants. Since the scales were empirically derived, and since different versions have shown transportability across institutional and program types, they offer legal defensibility for fair hiring decisions.

Second, these analyses provide a way to diagnose needs for faculty training. Ratings which assess a DOF's proficiency on tasks and dimensions could be an important developmental tool. Further, such ratings could be a part of an overall program evaluation. The use of empirically-defined scales has provided business and industry with a mechanism for systematically gathering information from job incumbents, supervisors, peers, and subordinates. The same could be true for academics. A standardized measure, based on dimensions derived from job analysis, provides a tool for obtaining systematic input about a forensics program from students, faculty colleagues, coaches, and administrators. Educational program asessment is increasingly important to legislatures and accreditors, and such input

provides persuasive evidence of program or DOF effectiveness. It offers the same advantages for demonstrating program effectiveness to departmental or institutional administrators.

Despite the potential application and utility of the evaluation instrument(s), this study has limitations which subsequent research should address. The first of these was the highly select sample which responded to the survey. The response rate of approximately 30%, while not unusual in survey-based research, is likely to produce a suboptimal sample.

The analysis suggests the adequacy of the identified performance dimensions for the positon of forensics director, almost all of them independent of institutional or program type. If so, the dimensions and the instrument are likely transportable and useful for assessment purposes. However, further research should confirm that the consistency detected in the instrument is stable and not a byproduct of sampling bias, especially if the dimensions and tasks are to be used for performance assessment or selection.

Finally, while the evaluation form appears to be generalizable to all types of programs in all types and sizes of institutions, each program must continue to personalize (e.g., appropriately adapt and weigh) these dimensions/tasks so as to best reflect the mission and goals of that program, department, and/or college or university. Schnoor (1993) advocates, "We must take a look at what we are doing , why we are doing it, and how it fits with the overall mission and goals of our sponsoring educational institutions" (p. 7). His sentiments are echoed by the Working Committee from the Quail Roost Conference on Assessment of Professional Activities of Directors of Debate who declare that the "basis for evaluation should be grounded explicitly in the mission statements of the institution, department, and debate program" (AFA Policy, 1993, p. 1) It is hoped, through the dissemination and use of these forensics evaluation instruments, that administrators and DOFs alike will have an increased understanding of and clearer evaluative tool for the activity we call forensics.

References

AFA Policy Debate Caucus. (1993). Report of the working committee from the quail roost conference on assessment of professional activities of directors of debate. Draft document.

Albert, L. S. (1991). Forensics as scholarly activity from the administrative perspective. (Contract No. CS-507-682). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Alexander, B. K. (1993, November). Evaluating program administration: Looking out, looking in: An evaluation of selection procedures. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami, FL.

Baehr, M. E., Lonergan, W. G., & Hunt, B. A. (1988). The managerial and professional job functions inventory. Park Ridge: London House, Inc.

Bernardin, H. J., & Beatty, R. W. (1984). Performance appraisal: Assessing human behavior at work. Boston: Kent.

Boileau, D. M. (1990). The role of department chair as forensics promoter. National Forensics Journal, 8, 87-94.

Definitional statement. (1974). Forensics as communication: The argumentative perspective (pp. 11-49). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Dudczak, C. A. (1985). Philosophy and reality at a research university. (Contract No. CS-505-097). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Dudczak, C. A., & Zarefsky, D. (1984). Promotions and tenure standards. In D. Parson (Ed.) American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics (pp. 23-35). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Hollwitz, J., & Danielson, M. A. (1992). Industrial assessment in higher education: Applying job analysis to faculty and administrative performance. In T. W. Banta and Anderson (Eds.) Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Assessing Quality in Higher Education (pp. 361-372). Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis.

Richardson, L. S. (1991). Competing academic priorities and the director of forensics: Do we need a broader definition of scholarship? (Contract No. Cs-507-845). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Rieke, R. D. (1968). A philosophy of forensics. In D. F. Faules & R. D. Rieke (Eds.) Directing forensics: Debate and contest speaking (pp. 33-78). Scranton, PA: Internatinal Textbook Company.

Schmalz, R. F. (1989, January 18). Many artist-teachers are penalized by colleges' current procedures for evaluating faculty productivity. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. B1-B2.

Schnoor, L. (1993, November). Assessing the university individual event program. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami, FL.

Smith, P. C., & Kendall, L. M. (1963). Retranslation of expectations: An approach to the construction of unambiguous anchors for rating scales. Journal of Applied Psychology, 47, 149-155.

Sternhagen, F. (1994, October 3). Forensic program evaluation efforts. Electronic mail transmission.

Uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures. (1978). Federal Register, 43, 38290-38315.

Footnote

[1] In earlier reports (1992), the eight dimensions were delineated into five "essential" dimensions and three "relevant" dimensions. Upon elimination of some uncodeable responses, a recalculation of dimensions revealed that "recruiting students for the speech/debate program" mean fell from 2.55 to 2.45. The recalculation did not change any other dimension, nor did it change the composition of the overall eight dimensions.

Appendix A
Standard Evaluation Form*

_____ARRANGING STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN OFF-CAMPUS TOURNAMENTS

--Skill at safe driving

--willingness to travel to speech and debate tournaments on Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays

_____ADMINISTERING THE SPEECH/DEBATE PROGRAM

--knowledge of national forensics rules and regulations

--ability to formulate team goals

_____COACHING SPEECH/DEBATE PARTICIPANTS

--knowledge of rules regulating speech and debate competitions

--ability to conduct rehearsals

--ability to identify appropriate selections/topics for use in performance

--ability to build good working-group relations

_____ACCOUNTING AND BOOKKEEPING

--knowledge of campus funding procedures

_____RECRUITING STUDENTS FOR THE SPEECH/DEBATE PROGRAM

_____TEACHING A SPEECH/DEBATE CLASS

--ability to assess student proficiency in speech and debate class(es)

_____DIRECTING ON-CAMPUS TOURNAMENTS

_____COUNSELING AND ADVISING SPEECH/DEBATE STUDENTS

--skill at listening to student concerns

--ability to improve participants' morale

Appendix B
Expanded Evaluation Form*

_____ARRANGING STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN OFF-CAMPUS TOURNAMENTS

--Skill at safe driving

--ability to drive different university-owned vehicles

--willingness to travel to speech and debate tournaments on Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays

_____ADMINISTERING THE SPEECH/DEBATE PROGRAM

--knowledge of national forensics rules and regulations

--knowledge of university insurance procedures

--skill at writing reports

--ability to formulate team goals

--ability to motivate subordinates

_____COACHING SPEECH/DEBATE PARTICIPANTS

--knowledge of rules regulating speech and debate competitions

--knowledge of newspapers or periodicals used in speech/debate preparation

--ability to conduct rehearsals

--ability to identify appropriate selections/topics for use in performance

--ability to match participants with competition events

--ability to build good working-group relations

_____ACCOUNTING AND BOOKKEEPING

--knowledge of campus funding procedures

--knowledge of university bookkeeping procedures

--knowledge of basic accounting principles

Expanded Evaluation Form continued

_____RECRUITING STUDENTS FOR THE SPEECH/DEBATE PROGRAM

--knowledge of university recruiting and admissions policies

_____TEACHING A SPEECH/DEBATE CLASS

--skill at lecturing on speech/debate topics

--ability to assess student proficiency in speech and debate class(es)

_____DIRECTING ON-CAMPUS TOURNAMENTS

--ability to run speech and debate tournaments

_____COUNSELING AND ADVISING SPEECH/DEBATE STUDENTS

--skill at listening to student concerns

--ability to improve participants' morale

* Evaluation forms list dimensions and tasks only. It is recommended that all evaluation items be evaluated via program, departmental, and university mission statements. It is also recommended that programs individualize the forms through adaptation of items and weightings of tasks and dimensions. Finally, it is recommended that this form be used in combination with other university forms and methods for faculty evaluation.

Table 1
DEMOGRAPHICS*

1. Type of Institution

A. private	14 (23%)
B. 2 year	6 (10%)
C. 4 year	40 (67%)

2. Size of Institution

A. less than 1,000 students	5 (8%)
B. 1,001-5,000	19 (31%)
C. 5,001-10,000	12 (20%)
D. 10,001-20,000	15 (25%)
E. over 20,000	10 (16%)

3. Type of Program

A. speech only	12 (20%)
B. speech with LD	5 (8%)
C. Debate only	9 (15%)
D. Both speech and Debate	34(57%)

4. Size of Program

A. 0-5	4 (7%)
B. 6-10	11(19%)
C. 11-20	21 (36%)
D. 21-30	8 (13%)
E. 31-40	8 (13%)
F. over 40	7 (12%)

5. Program Staffing:

Full-time only programs	22 (35%)
Part-time only programs	3 (5%)
Graduate Assistants only	2 (3%)
F-T and P-T programs	8 (13%)
F-T and GTA	19 (30%)
F-T and Paid Assts.	5 (8%)

Totals:
70 Full time
27 Part-time
62 Graduate Teaching Assistants
6 Paid Assistants

6. Budgets (Travel) Range: $2,500-$70,000

17	under $10,000
17	$10,000-19,999
17	$20,000-29,999
5	$30,000-39,999
2	$40,000-49,999
2	$over 50,000

*Demographic information reflects responses from 59-62 programs, as not all programs completed all information. One program left all of Part three blank.